

1963

put; no import restrictions, no subsidies and no immigration limitations. The market must be free; the mobility of labor must be unhampered throughout the world; and no artificial props or favors must be supplied to any factor of production. Otherwise the operation of the theory would be faulty to an incalculable degree.

Interferences such as those represented by minimum wage and maximum hour laws, acreage controls, and price supports, tariffs, immigration quotas, control of interest rates, monopoly, etc., would be taboo. Such intrusions into the free play of economic forces would upset the natural balance and mock the free-trade principle. Inefficiencies might be shielded and perpetuated.

In the world as it is and as it developed, innumerable interferences have nevertheless in fact been instituted and exercised.

Countless varieties of controls, prohibitions, regulations and licenses, differing in many instances from country to country, have proliferated over the landscape of history and the end is not yet. More and more, economic planning is being substituted for the free market forces. These numerous and far-sweeping interferences make determinations of relative industry and agricultural efficiency a hopeless excursion into the deep fogs of dubious economics.

How then determine which industry or farm crop enjoys either an absolute or a comparative advantage, free from bias, distortion, political favoritism, or artificial support?

What the economic planners overlook is that we can no longer look to the free play of market forces to assure a "more effective allocation of resources" because the hand of Government has interfered too extensively with these forces. Therefore the benefits of the law of comparative advantage would devolve upon the felicitous exercise of good judgment by the planners rather than the automatic operation of free market forces. And there is the rub.

The economic world has grown up in international compartments, many of them on different levels. The degree of insulation has varied, but the international free play of economic forces is a myth far removed from reality. Political interferences have been varied and extensive. In other cases barriers of a score of varieties have been utilized to prevent uncushioned foreign competition.

In this country our tariff (with such exceptions as a tariff for revenue only, as when in the past we levied a duty on coffee) has generally recognized the principle of absolute advantage in foreign production by the provision of a liberal free list. Coffee, bananas, cocoa, tea and other products that we could only produce at a distinct disadvantage, have been imported on duty-free basis for many years. Also, such minerals as tin, copper ore, asbestos, ores of gold, silver, iron, nickel, platinum, chrome and cobalt; uncut diamonds, chalk, coal, asphalt, plaster rock, sulfur, etc., are admitted free of duty.

Beyond that certain raw materials such as hides and skins, raw silk, raw furs, wood pulp, pulpwood and newsprint, logs, cork, crude rubber, sisal, jute, essential oils, tanning materials, etc., are treated in the same manner. Tuna fish, shrimp, lobsters, shellfish, agricultural implements, typewriters, needles, shingles, barbed wire, are other items on the free list.

Today some 40 percent of our imports represent items on which we levy no duty. Moreover, we have reduced the average duty on dutiable items by some 80 percent since 1934. The average duty is now about 11 percent on dutiable items as against 50 percent before that year.

The industrial and farm products on which we do maintain a duty face different degrees of import competition. It is assumed by the free trade advocates that if the duty

on all these products were removed the law of comparative advantage would automatically root out the less efficient industries.

The industries at the bottom of efficiency would be driven out of business and as a result our capital, land, and labor would be devoted to the remaining more efficient ones.

As an exercise in blissful theory such reasoning is unassailable. If, however, we are cruel enough to measure the theory by the yardstick of economic and political reality it assumes a different aspect. Several rough boulders lie in the path of the theory and they are well imbedded and not easily moved.

Were it possible to unwind the economic reel back to the beginning of economic time and then rewind it under circumstances of laissez faire, thus leaving the market forces to do their work freely, protecting nothing and no one against the rudeness of those forces, it might be possible to assess the value of free trade and its fruits.

This must, of course, forever remain impossible because we cannot unwind history and then rewind it to suit our fancy.

Therefore the fact is that even though industry and agriculture in this country developed under relatively free market conditions, both nevertheless were either the beneficiaries or victims of various interferences, such as the tariff (throughout our history as a nation), immigration restrictionism (since the early decades of this century), land grants to railroads, various specific subsidies, etc. Then there were interferences in the form of regulations, such as antitrust laws, to assure that freer play of market forces; for experience with monopolies had demonstrated that free market forces themselves could be used by competent manipulators to control other market forces. Therefore to preserve free market forces, the Government stepped in to protect the innocent market forces against market forces that were cannibalistic or at least regarded as predatory.

This was followed in the past three decades with far-reaching interferences by the Government to the point where we can no longer claim to have a free market. We have freedom within rather rigid limitations, with some segments or areas enjoying more freedom than others.

How conceivably unravel the relative degree of efficiency and inefficiencies within and among our industries today? Some industries are highly concentrated and so great in size that individual companies within them are as large as half a dozen smaller whole industries combined. (Compare the automotive industry with book manufacturing, cutlery, luggage, wire, pottery, wallpaper, etc.) Other industries count among their companies huge ones alongside of those classed as medium and others that are small. Yet these "small" ones may be larger than the large ones of other smaller industries. Yet other industries, because of the limitation of the whole market, can boast only of relatively small companies; for example, makers of clothespins.

Where then is a yardstick of efficiency to be found? Efficient or inefficient compared with what? Should a small company in the textile industry be compared with General Motors or Du Pont? Or should it be compared with a small company of another industry?

But what if the two industries, measured by the law of comparative advantage, are not of the same level of efficiency? May not a small company in an "inefficient" industry in fact be more efficient (in the sense of management and progressiveness) than another company of the same size in an "efficient" industry?

Strangely enough the economists who speak of "inefficiency" of an industry do not provide a bill of particulars. Oh, they

may say that management is inefficient, but to say that is only to utter so many words. Wherein is the management inefficient? In finance, administration, production, advertising, sales, storekeeping, accounting, and in what specific operations in any specific department? The economists would rather be much more general in their indictments.

Let us say, for example, that the industry dedicated to handmade glassware is inefficient in the economic sense, i.e., it has not adopted or discovered the technological methods that would bring it to the forefront. Is it not possible that individual companies in the industry could be as efficient managerially as another company that operates in the manufacture of electronics? Obviously this not only could be possible but may be expected to be found in more instances than one.

Yet, without any investigation the glassware industry would be classified as inefficient. By that measure every industry was at one time inefficient. This was true of the cigarette industry, of the carriage industry, the pretzel industry and hundreds of others. Then, not by any schedule but by the magic chance of invention someone discovered a revolutionary mechanical principle and the inefficient industry was sprung to the forefront of "efficiency" in the sense of jumping into the technological vanguard.

Had such industries been condemned to die in a naked combat with imports before technological invention lifted them out of the list of inefficient industries we would have lost them to our economy. Yet today there are many other such industries that would be unseasonably condemned to death and our economic diversity would suffer.

When will table glassware be made by machinery? It is already so made. Yet there is a consumer demand for the more artistic workmanship and individual design that only handicraft can supply. The same can be said of certain items of pottery and other consumer products. Should industries of this type be doomed, thus sacrificing the skill and artistry that not only add to the choice in household decoration but also give far greater satisfaction to the working artisans than turning a screw or pushing a button? Moreover, other countries continue to make glassware and other products of this type. Are they then more efficient economically than our producers merely because they can undersell us? Evidently not, because they are also technologically in the backwaters. Are they then more efficient as artisans, as skillful workers?

How measure this? The only present effective measure is the price at which they can lay down their products in this country. The theoretical economist will jump to the unjustified conclusion that if the domestic industry cannot compete with imports it thereby convicts itself automatically of relative inefficiency. Can this be a proper verdict? The least that could be demanded would be a showing of the relative hourly output of the domestic and the foreign artisans. Unquestionably it would be found that the American artisan would at least equal his foreign competitor.

The principal difference then would be found in the price of labor; and it is here that the American industry would reflect the higher cost. The American worker receives from 3 to 10 or more times the wages of his foreign counterpart (Canada excepted).

Should American industries of this type be sacrificed on the altar of comparative advantage? Must we vacate industry after industry (1) because our wages are higher than the foreign pay even if our artisans are as efficient as their foreign competitors but are condemned as "economically inefficient"; (2) because for the time being modern technology has not yet erased the demand for the more artistic, warmer, and more exquisite product of skilled craftsmen;

November 14

and (8) because our labor must not waste its time with antiquated methods but should be retrained for advanced jobs for which many other workers are already waiting and panting in the pool of futility?

Application to the principle of comparative advantage in practice would, as already hinted, impose a superhuman burden. The American coal industry, already mentioned, is the most efficient in the world in point of output per man-hour because of its behemoth machines developed in recent years. The output per man-hour has doubled in a little over 10 years and the number of mineworkers more than cut in half. Yet the industry is counted as inefficient in the economic sense because petroleum and natural gas and residual fuel oil are less costly to produce. Therefore, by the theory of comparative efficiency or advantage, the coal industry should go the way of the dinosaur.

Yet, should the industry be abandoned, it would release more than 150,000 coal miners and much capital and machinery. Railroads that haul coal would suffer, etc. Moreover, the competitive fuels are not inexhaustible. In a decade it might become necessary to reopen the coal mines, and that would indeed be a costly undertaking.

Yet such is the imperative of the theory that these risks would have to be run if we are to be true to it.

What then is the worth of a theory that crumbles if it is touched by the fingertip of reality? Oh, it acts as a guide on a path that cannot in most cases be followed.

The slavish devotion of the free-trade economists to their theories only underlines nothing more clearly than their separation from reality.

Considering the rapid movement of modern technology, it should be very clear that the law of comparative advantage would have only temporary validity in many fields. Yet it is the very cornerstone of the free trade structure. Did not Japan enjoy a great advantage in silk production? What happened to this circumstance? Was not our own southern cotton king for many years? Where does it stand today? Did the law of absolute advantage save it? What happened to Chilean nitrates? Where in the industrial ranks is crude rubber today? How long can Australia expect to rest so much of her economic dependence on wool? Yet here were products in which forward advantage once resided not so long ago. How would free trade have preserved them?

Today we find it necessary to subsidize raw cotton at 8½ cents per pound in order to export it. Where in the scale of comparative advantage does our cotton culture stand today? Where is the economist's prescription? Is the doctrine of free trade not becoming irrelevant in the technological world?

Today it is possible that an American industry may be ruinously menaced by imports of products of a crassly inefficient foreign industry that may enjoy very little of the true economic advantages demanded by the principles of free trade. Such a foreign industry might in fact be hard put to explain its competitive advantage on any ground other than lower wages. This is not an economic advantage of the kind contemplated by Adam Smith. The foreign industry might have less advanced machinery, operate under antiquated methods, and adhere to a more pedestrian pace of production. Should it pay the American scale of wages, it might be hopelessly out of the competitive race. Yet an American industry unable to compete with such a foreign industry would be condemned as inefficient.

If the principle of free trade were indeed honestly applied, the laws of economics would in reality be violated if such a foreign industry were permitted to subdue the American producer. The law of economic

progress would be set back. The very incentive to progress would be smothered, and the laurels would go, not to the deserving contestant, but to the economic laggard.

When such unequal competitive forces are thrown against each other the reason must be political or anything but economic; it cannot be justified by the law of comparative advantage or any good principle of free trade.

Such justification is a pernicious practice since it drapes the mantle of supposed respectability over the shoulders of a program that is fast becoming indefensible.

The free market, such as we had of it was good. It was under its dispensation that this country easily gained the industrial leadership of the world; but we cannot restore it by undoing the tariff while binding down free enterprise in other vital sectors, thus making it less competitive.

The visible result of ignoring this fact may be seen in the reluctance of domestic capital to venture at home, preferring in many instances the foreign soil. By confronting our producing enterprises on a broad front with rising import competition that will contest any expanded market for increased domestic output with us, thus pinching down the profit incentive, we are lowering the horizon of our economic growth and enhancing displacement of workers by machinery. The latter theoretically should lead to greater eventual employment but will not do so when industry cannot reap its own reward but is doomed to see its hope of profit dissipated in an uneven battle with imports advantaged by wage rates that would be illegal in this country.

Why we insist on weighting down our producing industries with handicaps that award the greatest cost advantage, namely, lower wage costs per unit of production, to their foreign competitors, is a question that could only be answered by a psychoanalysis of the governmental free-trade doctrinaires.

The law of comparative advantage has already been buried beneath a mesh of economic controls. It has been rendered impotent as a usable guide in a world in which technology renders yesterday's advantage obsolete, or springs a chronic laggard industry into the front ranks tomorrow. Why play as if the law still had a meaning outside the field of theory when bushels of domestic legislation contradict its very foundations every year? And when political considerations keep it handcuffed and tethered by a short leash?

This rock on which free trade rests should be sent to a museum as a curiosity of classical economics and as a handy pawn used by pragmatic economists for purposes of their own.

V. N. Fife
The Kennedy-Supported Coup in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

or

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that President Kennedy has two standards for military juntas. If they are anti-Communist, he delays recognition but if the junta has assassinated six anti-Communists of the previous government, he immediately recognizes them.

With all the managed news in the United States, regarding the situation in Vietnam, it is refreshing to submit herewith an editorial which appeared in

the Tablet on November 7, an article from yesterday's Washington Daily News by William F. Buckley, Jr., and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 7.

The editorials and articles follow:

[From the Tablet, Nov. 7, 1963]

A FAITHFUL ALLY MURDERED

The American people, we dare say, do not share the satisfaction of many Washington officials and their political mouthpieces over the coup which destroyed the Diem regime in South Vietnam. Aside from the foul murder of Diem and his brother—outrageous crimes which the new regime contemptibly called suicide—it must not be forgotten that the United States owed a tremendous debt to Ngo Dinh Diem.

It was this murdered ruler who from 1950 to 1950 in World War II fought the Japanese occupation of Vietnam, opposed the continuance of French rule and spurned an alliance with Ho Chi Minh, the Vietnamese Communist leader. In 1952, threatened by both French and native Communists, he left his homeland, lived in exile in the United States until he could return to Vietnam in 1954. Then by public demand—and on the insistence of John Foster Dulles, U.S. Secretary of State—he accepted the premiership under the playboy Emperor Bao Dai. He fought for the liberty of the people, destroyed the private armies oppressing the populace, and on October 23, 1955, by courageous leadership, achieved a popular referendum. He won; Bao Dai was exiled; South Vietnam became a republic, and Diem became the head of state.

In 1960 he defeated disgruntled military and civilian elements who sought to destroy democratic rule. In 1961 he called for an election so that the people could exercise a voice in the running of the government, and he was overwhelmingly reelected for a second term.

Six months later, October 19, 1961, Diem cited the Communists as a rising menace to South Vietnam, and received power from the national assembly to rule by decree in order to maintain national security. In December of 1961 he received military support from President Kennedy and large financial help from the United States. In February of 1962 he defeated an attempted coup.

That is the written record of the man who was betrayed last Friday and murdered by individuals whose lives he saved and whose liberty he protected. Well, indeed, and to his credit, U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, majority leader, uniquely asserted: "I am shocked and grieved to hear of the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem, an old and valued friend. He was a man of great integrity and great patriotism. It is sad, indeed, that such a man should be the victim of an atrocious crime."

Unhonored, unsung and scarcely mentioned by official Washington was the man who singlehandedly rallied Vietnam to the free world's side, after the great powers had cynically written it off to communism, as far back as the 1959 Geneva Conference. He rendered the world a great service in the fight against the Red pestilence, and should have been applauded for his moral, courageous and intelligent leadership.

Diem had his faults. In recent years he made enemies. His judgment at times was open to criticism. His brother, it is said, made his path difficult and gave his opponents issues over which to assail him. However, it is sad but undoubtedly correct to state that the present administration in Washington, through a frequently blundering State Department, was not an innocent bystander in last Friday's coup. This was not a united movement to destroy Diem for, while some U.S. officials maintained the war in Vietnam was going badly, others—Gen.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7079

Paul D. Harkins, commander of the 16,000 "American advisers" in that country—asserted the day before the coup that victory was only months away. In addition, Secretary of Defense McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after a survey on the scene asserted that by the end of 1965 the Communist Vietcong guerrillas would be defeated. None of these men said Diem, or his family, was an insuperable drag upon military success. Despite this expert testimony, however, the following chain of events was effective in helping to pull the rug from Diem's feet:

1. Liberal correspondents in Saigon carried on a continual war against the Vietnam regime and the family of the chief of state.

2. The upper level of the U.S. State Department, the Saigon offices of foreign aid and the U.S. information agencies, and even the White House itself, engaged in the disparaging campaign.

3. The drive picked up speed with the first self-immolation by a Buddhist in Saigon. A cry of religious "repression" was made. The Vietnam regime insisted it was a local disturbance, based on politics, to discredit the government.

4. On the nights of August 24–25, the U.S. State Department officials sent a cable, which was broadcast by the USA, assailing Diem and extended to the people of Vietnam an invitation to oust the government.

5. On September 2, President Kennedy, in his television interview with Walter Cronkite, censured Diem and hinted at the need of changes in personnel in the regime.

6. Twenty-two U.S. Senators, most of them professed liberals, signed a manifesto demanding the end of all American aid to the Diem regime unless it reformed, and other groups, taking the cue, printed anti-Diem statements and advertisements in U.S. papers—most of which were based on bigotry.

7. Mme. Nhu came to the United States to plead the government's cause. A brilliant and patriotic woman, she was ostracized by the administration and harassed by Government mouthpieces all over the country. Her father was induced to resign his diplomatic post in Washington, and her sister was enlisted to join the campaign to discredit her and the Saigon members of the family.

These various actions of U.S. officials created not only an unfriendly climate and antagonistic atmosphere but also pressures which had plenty to do with creating an uprising.

It was, to put it politely, a shabby business, and it is not made understandable when one reads of the administration denouncing the military coups in Santo Domingo and Honduras, and refusing to recognize the new regimes there, while on the other hand there is talk of immediate recognition of those responsible for the coup in South Vietnam, including the accomplices in the murder of the President and his brother. It will be recalled the lives of the rulers of Santo Domingo and Honduras were spared by the "leaders" of the coups in those countries.

The American conscience is stirred by what has happened in Vietnam, and it will live with us, as well as with people all over the world, for many years.

At the same time all of us hope the new regime in South Vietnam will carry on the war continually and successfully against the Communist enemy, as Diem did, for that is not only the hope of all of us but the primary plank in the platform of the new regime.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 13, 1963]

AMERICAN WAY OF DEATH

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Mr. Diem is dead, and Mr. Nhu; and there is dancing in the streets of Saigon and, as

a matter of fact, in the streets of New York and Washington, and other centers of civilization. If the dances were a little inhibited, perhaps it is because Mme. Nhu still lives—if she too had been murdered, the joy would have been unconfined.

As it is, she was alive when it happened, in Los Angeles with her daughter, at the end of a grueling tour of this country during which she tried to make two points to the American public, namely (1), that the Diem regime's iniquities were largely fabricated, and (2), that the Diem regime's survival was central to the success of the anti-Communist operation in southeast Asia. Then at one stroke she lost her husband, her brother-in-law, her home, her mission. Time marches on, what?

The Widow Nhu charges that her family and regime were killed, actually, in Washington. The lady must be allowed poetic license. She does not mean to say that American bullets killed her family—I should say, American executioners: the bullets undoubtedly were made in the United States—but rather that her family was killed as a result of American policy. The genteel way to put it was of course formulated by the New York Times. American activities, said the Times, "helped to prepare the psychological atmosphere for the coup."

Madam Nhu keeps insisting that her family was the administrative soul and spirit of the fight against the Communists, and the prosecutor counters by saying: How can that be? Considering that the people of South Vietnam danced in the streets at the news of their downfall? But one might answer, such are the ways of the people. They dance at the revolution, and they dance at the restoration. They danced in the streets of Peiping when Chiang Kai-shek was driven away by the Communists. Well, but surely we will now have stability in South Vietnam, a stability which we can harness into effective anti-Communist action without the distractions of a despot who kept outraging world opinion.

Are we indeed so sure? That is what they said after Syngman Rhee's ouster from Korea—do you remember him? He, too, like Mr. Diem, was revered as the George Washington of his country, but he, too, grew despotic and corrupt, and was finally ousted. And what happened? In the succeeding 5 years there have been three different governments in South Korea, and the current one is giving us most trouble of all.

There are two ways of looking at the Diem regime. The one way focuses exclusively on its sins (as measured according to the Western code). It remains a mystery just exactly what they are, though if Mr. Diem did not sin he probably would be the first ruler since St. Louis who hasn't. Take the version most scarlet of his sins, and even then he cannot compare in venality with such other despots—Ceylon's, Burma's, Indonesia's, to name three countries in the immediate area—against whom no hue and cry is raised.

The second standard calls for focusing on the relative performance of Mr. Diem. As to that, listen to the majority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Democratic Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, who said of him the day after he had died that he was "a courageous man," a "man of integrity," a "great patriot."

But that is not enough these days in the court of public opinion. He was something else again quite utterly disqualifying. He was a relentless, undeviating, acting, fighting anti-Communist. That is the besetting sin of our time, and few can survive it. Anti-Communists who unflinchingly support American programs tend to end up (Diem) with bullets in their heads; or (Rhee) exiled; or (Chiang) puppetized; or (Salazar) beleaguered. In international politics, a strong and purposive friendship for this country and its international purposes tends to lead

to what one might call the American way of death.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 7, 1963]

REMAINS TO BE SEEN

With a line of reasoning almost too convoluted to be comprehended, a clique of commentators has been hailing the coup in South Vietnam as a great and shining triumph in the field of American foreign policy. Maybe so, but we doubt it. We think this is a situation in which everybody would be well advised to keep in mind the overworked but quite useful phrase about how it remains to be seen.

It remains to be seen, for example, whether the new regime will actually be as effective as that of the late President Diem in fighting the Communists. One must hope that it will be, but there are no absolute assurances on that score. What also remains to be seen is how the so-called Buddhists—the ones who are far more political than religious—will cooperate with the "revolutionary" government in Saigon, which has brutally disposed of Mr. Diem and his brother, both once hailed as heroes in our official literature.

What remains to be seen, too, is how the Chinese Communists will exploit the South Vietnamese mess. There are disquieting indications that they are bent on using Buddhism—which is based on a belief in God—to support Red atheism by stirring up further strife in places like Laos, which seems to be verging on the edge of disintegration. Peiping, in any case, has been playing host to a gathering of "Buddhists" from all parts of Asia, and this gathering—harshly anti-American in tone—has made noises suggesting that "monks" and "priests" will be used to advance communism's cause.

What is ironical about all this is that the Chinese Communists, during their rape of Tibet a few years ago, destroyed over 1,000 Buddhist monasteries. Accordingly, to put it mildly, the "Buddhists" who are now playing Peiping's game in Vietnam and the rest of Asia need to be given a very hard look. Beyond that, we must reckon with the fact that a lot of people over there, seeing how we have dealt with the Diem regime, must feel just a little bit uneasy about cooperating with us. To that extent, despite the enthusiastic commentators, what has happened in Saigon seems something less than a development our country can gloat over or feel proud of.

Tired of It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the November 10 issue of the Sunday Star sets out the sentiments of a great many Americans, including myself. I am inserting it in the RECORD for the information of those Members who may not have seen it:

TIRED OF IT ALL

President Kennedy, in accepting a distinguished service award from a Protestant group, got in the following plug for his foreign aid program:

"I think the American people are willing to shoulder this burden * * *. Some say they are tiring of this task, or tired of world problems, or tired of hearing those who receive our aid disagree with our diplomacy.

A7080**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—APPENDIX****November 14**

But what kind of spirit is that? Are we tired of living in a free world? Do we expect to make it over in our own image? Are we going to quit now because there are problems not yet solved?"

The implication here is that the American people (who have been lugging the foreign aid load for 17 years) are ready, willing, and happy to keep on lugging it. Some other President, 17 years in the future, may be saying pretty much the same thing. But we dissent.

It is our belief that the American people, or most of them, are sick and tired of foreign aid. They are fed up with doling out billions in American tax dollars to people who couldn't care less about what we in this country like to speak of as the American way of life. They are bored to tears with the threadbare argument that the Communists will take over the world unless we pay the bills for countries which don't know or care which team they are playing on, assuming that they are willing to play on any team. Mr. Khrushchev can't even feed his own people. Why not let him try this foreign aid load for size?

To sum up, we think the American people, as far as foreign aid is concerned, have just about had it. And we haven't the slightest doubt that it is this more than anything else which underlies the attitude of Congress—an attitude which the President either can't or won't understand.

This Congress, of course, will pass a foreign aid bill. But the appropriation will be sharply cut back. And it should be. The 88th Congress will go down in history (with applause), if it begins the quick phasing out of foreign aid. And we do not believe that the rest of the world, without the Yankee dollar, will go either to pot or to the Communists.

Our Underpaid Federal Judges**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, recently gave its editorial support to increased salaries for Federal judges as provided by H.R. 8716 and H.R. 8717.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

Our UNDERPAID FEDERAL JUDGES

"All of us pay heed to the vast sums earmarked for foreign aid. We raise our voices in disapproval. All of us pay heed in the vast sums earmarked for military outlay. We tacitly approve this protection of our homeland and our own self defense. But we are prone to disregard Federal salaries here at home that long have been disregarded."

An outstanding instance of underpaid posts are Federal judgeships. The last increase granted U.S. judges was in 1955. At that time the increase only partially corrected the salary imbalance then existing. Today those salaries are completely out of line with the economic and official needs of those serving in our judiciary branch of Government.

Congress is being urged to include Federal judges and Members of Congress in the pending legislation to raise the pay scale for postal workers and classified civil service employees. Congressman Morris Udall, Arizona

Democrat, and Congressman Joe BROWN, Virginia Republican, introduced omnibus bills (H.R. 8716 and H.R. 8717) last month urging this inclusion.

The proposed judicial salary increases would raise district, customs and tax court judges from \$22,500 to \$35,000 annually. Judges of the U.S. circuit courts and other appellate courts would be raised from \$25,500 to \$40,500. Associate Justices of the Supreme Court would receive \$50,000 yearly instead of the present \$35,000. The Chief Justice, who now receives \$35,500 would receive \$50,500.

We want our judicial system to be the finest possible. To have this we must have good men in high judicial posts. Men of legal stature deserve comparable remuneration. Yet we see highly qualified, highly competent men leaving private practice to accept Federal judgeships that pay them a salary below the worth of their educational ability. Five Federal judges, one in eastern Missouri, come quickly to mind who left private practice in the \$65,000 bracket to accept Federal judgeships.

If we are to retain the best minds in Federal judgeships we are going to have to pay them their worth. The public should support the measure before Congress to secure better salaries for our Federal judges.

**Should Military Operations Be in Charge
of Career Military Officers or Tempor-
ary Civilian Appointees?**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. L. S. Sabin, U.S. Navy, retired, during his active career conducted with great brilliance the evacuation of French Indo-China and several other touchy military operations at remote overseas locations. He acquitted himself and the Nation with honor. He had been trained for this work throughout his lifetime in the service. That, in fact, is what the Nation has, in the past, trained its military officers to do. No matter what today's so-called defense intellectuals say, there is no substitute for mature judgment and decisive action at the scene of a crisis. If this Nation is to continue to be a winner, it must continue to adhere to those techniques which have proven successful. In a communication in the November issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Admiral Sabin eloquently argues this point as follows:

The career military officer is in a highly specialized and very complex profession. Years of education and training have gone into making him a flag officer, and during those years he has probably been subjected to the most rigid selectivity in the world. The civilian Secretaries come and go. For a transitory Secretary of Defense or his equally transitory civilian assistants to qualify themselves as military operational experts in the few years they hold office is not only nonsense—it is dangerous nonsense. The fact that a man has made a successful career out of directing the business of a large corporation no more qualifies him as an expert in military operations than does a successful military career qualify an

officer to direct the affairs of a large corporation.

The ridiculous bugaboo that it is necessary to crack down on the generals and flag officers to remind them of our National tradition of civilian control over the military is just so much fantasy. To use this as an excuse for the increasing intrusion by the civilian secretariat into the field of military operations is equally fantastic. The military of this Nation are not now nor have they ever been a threat to the proper and legal control traditionally exercised by their civilian political masters. Quite to the contrary, they are and have always been the most ardent supporters of this wholly proper concept of Government. It makes good news copy to report that a certain general or admiral has been "put in his place" by his civilian boss. But more often than not it does not make good sense as far as national security is concerned. The concept of civilian control over the military was never intended to extend to operational authority over the combat forces except as legally vested in the President of the United States. And I cannot recall any President who has ever tried to fight a battle from the White House.

Many of the silly administrative requirements imposed on the operating forces stem from the Pentagon and result from decisions made by transitory self-styled military experts who had little or no military operational experience when they assumed office and who will vacate their political offices in a few years at most having become operational military experts by commanding a large mahogany desk with an occasional side trip to the operating services. This is no reflection on those dedicated men, such as James Forrestal, who knew what their responsibilities were and discharged them with great credit to themselves and great benefit to the Nation.

It used to be that the War and Navy Departments existed for the support of their operating forces. Now it would appear that the operating forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force exist to support a colossal administrative organization in the Pentagon, in which respective service departments have been submerged to the point of anonymity. I have the sad—and somewhat frightening—idea that in the maze of administrative and technical matters which consume so much time in the Pentagon, there seems to have been a loss of memory as to the purpose of armies, navies, and air forces. They appear to have forgotten that it is the operating forces who must win wars, when and if wars are fought. Perhaps they should be reminded that if it were not for the operating forces there would be no need for a Department of Defense. As the hirings and firings of top military officers who dare to express their considered military judgment continue, the law of averages is bound to take over. Sooner or later an amenable service chief will be found who is willing to sacrifice his professional judgment for his job. And when that happens, the security of this Nation most certainly will have it.

Whose Quality?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL

Vietnam Postscript

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit with a column by Michael Padev, as appeared in the November 8, 1963, issue of the Indianapolis Star.

UNITED STATES WOULD EULOGIZE DIEM IF HE WERE RED

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—What do you think would have happened if the savagely murdered resident of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, had been a Communist or a leftwing socialist or a pro-Communist "Neutralist."

First, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, with a sad face, trembling voice, and almost tears in his eyes, would have made a solemn television statement denouncing indignantly the murder as a "crime against civilization," which had "shocked the conscience of the world." In case you have forgotten, this is exactly what Mr. Stevenson did when the Congo political leader, Patrice Lumumba, was assassinated some 2½ years ago.

Lumumba held no official position when he was killed; he was no friend of the United States; he was a near-Communist and "neutralist" adventurer, who was also a drug addict and a convicted thief. But the Communists, pro-Communists and "neutralists" simply loved him and, hence, "the conscience of the world" was easily aroused.

Second, the Communists and the "neutralists" in the United Nations would have passed a resolution demanding a full investigation and a U.N. Assembly debate on the Diem overthrow. The United States, mindful of "world public opinion," would have sided with the Reds and the "neutralists," and the U.N. Assembly would have heard many speeches glorifying the memory of Diem.

This, in case you have forgotten, was exactly what the U.N. did about Lumumba.

SHOCK AND HORROR

Third, White House and State Department spokesmen, including President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, would have publicly expressed their "shock and horror" and "heartfelt indignation." They would have made it clear that a military junta which came to power by such violent unconstitutional means would not be recognized as the Government of South Vietnam unless it "guaranteed" free elections, "rapidly returned to civilian rule," etc.

It would have also been announced that the United States would suspend all aid to South Vietnam "pending the restoration of democratic order."

In case you have forgotten, such was the attitude of the Kennedy administration toward several military coups undertaken in several Latin American countries against leftwing governments of one sort or another.

Last, but not least, the liberal establishment would have risen immediately and vociferously in protest against "police repressions" in South Vietnam. Prof. Lionel Appling from California (Nobel Prize winner) and Prof. Allen Schmeling of New York (Pulitzer Prize winner) would have headed a nationwide, bipartisan committee for a free South Vietnam. The New York Times would have carried a full page ad demanding that "those responsible for the horrible crimes against humanity in South Vietnam" be apprehended and punished.

RIGHT WING EXTREMISTS

The Washington Post would have published an indignant editorial pointing out

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7085

that "rightwing extremists," in South Vietnam as well as in France, in the United States, and in Timbuktu, are a danger to world peace.

Well, all these things would have happened, had Diem been a Communist, or a pro-Communist neutralist, or a leftwing socialist. But Diem, instead, had the misfortune of being a militant anti-Communist, heading a regime which was, on the whole, quite popular.

Diem also—unlike the Communist and pro-Communist heroes of "world public opinion," had a decent respect for the democratic and parliamentary institutions of his country. His regime was not, of course, a model democracy, but, comparatively speaking it was a representative regime, based on free elections. In addition, under Diem, South Vietnam enjoyed considerable freedom of the press.

One can understand why the Communists considered Diem as their No. 1 enemy in Vietnam, as well as south Asia. But can you understand why the "liberals" treated Diem the way they did?

Can you understand why "liberals," in general, behave the way they do? I can't.

Publisher Horvitz Reports on White House Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the report of Harry R. Horvitz, publisher of the Mansfield News-Journal, regarding a recent visit to the White House as the guest of President Kennedy. This article appeared in the November 10 issue of the News-Journal, one of the outstanding papers in my district.

I was particularly interested in one very perceptive remark which Mr. Horvitz made. He said:

He [the President] was articulate on all subjects—including politics. He is fond of Barry Goldwater personally, although he recognizes the basic philosophic differences. His characterization of the major differences between himself and Nelson Rockefeller was right to the point, the only difference being that Rockefeller was out and Kennedy in.

What an accurate statement. The only differences between President Kennedy and Governor Rockefeller being that the President is in office and the Governor is not. I call this firsthand report on a White House visit to the attention of the Members of this body.

PUBLISHER REPORTS ON WHITE HOUSE VISIT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Along with 19 other newspapermen, the publisher of the News-Journal was a guest at the White House last week. Here is his report of his visit.)

(By H. R. Horvitz)

I had lunch last Wednesday in the State Dining Room of the White House just one seat away from President John F. Kennedy.

The invitation came to me in the form of a telegram, "I would be most pleased to have you as my guest." Even Barry Goldwater's mother could not refuse an invitation like this.

Following the instructions of the telegram, I walked to the northwest gate of the White House. After proving my identity I was

allowed to proceed up to the front door. There gracious servants took my coat and ushered me to a table on which was a silver bowl and seating chart of the dining table. I drew a card from the bowl, a lucky draw indeed for it determined that I would be seated just one seat away from the President.

Before going into lunch the group of 20 Ohio editors and publishers, who had been invited, gathered in the historic Red Room. Here drinks were served and the Presidential Press Secretary, Pierre Salinger, arrived to put us all at ease.

Suddenly there was complete silence—everyone stood erect and the President of the United States entered. He shook hands and said a few words of welcome to each of us. We were at ease immediately.

John F. Kennedy is a strikingly handsome man. He is very tall and well built. His complexion was so healthy that it looked as if he were wearing makeup. Today he did not need a haircut. I was glad our wives were not present for he is easily as good looking as any movie star and I'm afraid we would all suffer by comparison.

He suggested that one of us should lead the way to the dining room, but we all deferred in unison, "But, Mr. President you are the leader."

The table was set with lace-edged doilies and the official gold plated silverware, and Lenox china. Each of us had a handsomely gold lettered placecard and printed menu at our place.

The food was delicious. First, shells filled with crabmeat thermidor. Then sirloin steak with waffle potatoes and green peas. Dessert was a mocha Bavarian mousse topped with whipped cream. Red wine was served with the meal and demitasse afterward.

SHARP ATTIRE

I was so close to the President that I could not help noticing his very sharp attire. He wore a two-button blue suit with narrow trousers and sleeves, white shirt french cuffed and a dark blue tie. He ate with great relish, even enjoying the rich dessert. Afterward he smoked a thin cigar, the first of three during the afternoon.

The President steered the luncheon conversation away from the important problems of our day but he did tell us of some of the great decisions which he faces. For example, many of the portraits of former Presidents are so poor that he is most anxious to choose the proper portrait painter for himself. His portrait should be painted before he leaves office, but of course Mr. Kennedy wouldn't say what that exact date would be.

The service was excellent so the meal was over in a half hour. For 1½ hours afterward we discussed various political and economic problems. Everyone was relaxed, probably made so by the President's wit and informal attitude.

He was articulate on all subjects—including politics. He is fond of BARRY GOLDWATER personally, although he recognizes the basic philosophic differences. His characterization of the major differences between himself and Nelson Rockefeller was right to the point, the only difference being that Rockefeller was out and Kennedy in.

His unhurried and leisurely manner, his obvious enjoyment of the luncheon and his ease in handling each question was most impressive. He was most diplomatic in hearing our demands for a balanced budget but not to the exclusion of a few favorite projects for Ohio.

As the luncheon meeting drew to a close, the President made a masterful political move. He offered to autograph the menus for the benefit of our children or grandchildren at home. Then after a cordial handshake, the President went back to his work.

As I walked down the White House steps out into the rain, I could not help thinking what a remarkable country this is when the President is willing to take time from his busy schedule to invite newspaper peo-

A7086

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 14

ple, some from very small papers, to have lunch with him. But as long as our President must run for reelection, it is obvious that the views of newspapers or any other voters are very important indeed.

Kennedy Administration Aid for Cuba?EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

MR. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago we were about to be blasted off the face of the earth by Russian missiles in Cuba. Now, according to an article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in the Long Island Press of November 8, we are to give emergency aid to Cuba. When will we wake up?

The article follows:

Emergency Aid Plan for Cuba Is Backing
(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—There is something afoot on giving hurricane-ravaged and Communist-managed Cuba emergency relief in the form of surplus U.S. farm commodities.

The project is very hush-hush and shrouded in tightest secrecy. But the following is definitely known:

Influential United Nations sources have put out feelers to the State Department on hurricane aid for Cuba. These backstage overtures have been made with the knowledge and approval of puppet Dictator Fidel Castro—despite his violent diatribes against accepting help from imperialists.

The little-known Interdepartmental Committee on Principles for Cuba, headed by Secretary Dean Rusk, is exploring the possibility of increasing contacts with the Castro regime.

A Central Intelligence Agency report, submitted to President Kennedy, states that the 5-day hurricane that ravaged Cuba last month inflicted "catastrophic" damage on its main crops. Sugar was slashed by an estimated 1.1 million tons; virtually all of the wheat crop in Oriente Province, which produces about 90 percent of this grain, was destroyed and more than 50 percent of the rice and tobacco crops were lost.

CIA estimated Cuba's total sugar output this year will be less than 2,250,000 tons. That is approximately one-third of the 6-million-ton plus tons averaged between 1957 and the Communist takeover.

It is also more than 2 million tons less than last year's production, which was 1 million tons under the previous year. Since the Reds have ruled Cuba, there has been a steady decline in sugar output. The same is true of every other export commodity.

Last month's massive hurricane destruction compounded the already high crop losses due to mismanagement, incompetence, waste, and bungling.

Congressional leaders have gotten wind of the undercover move to extend hurricane aid to Cuba, and are keeping a close eye on the matter. They are particularly aroused because of the bitter battle raging in the Senate over the President's multibillion-dollar foreign aid program.

Prior to the hurricane, Cuba had shipped several hundred thousand tons of sugar to Red China in exchange for 100,000 tons of rice. To help meet Cuba's serious shortage of footwear, Red China has sent a large shipment of shoes made of cloth and rubber, and North Korea a quantity of used military

boots. The Cuban freighter Puerto de Nuevitas, which sailed from Port Mariel with tanks, artillery, and ammunition for Algeria, switched names in mid-Atlantic. Port Mariel is used by Russia to unload most of its military supplies and personnel.

Secretary Dean Rusk has a simple strategy for ducking disconcerting congressional questions.

With unusual candor, the State Department head disclosed this during a private meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He had been sharply grilled on the embattled foreign aid bill, and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, chided him for being evasive.

"Senator, when I was a young member of the State Department and was down in this part of town," replied Rusk, "I was advised that when I got a question that I couldn't answer, to answer another one."

Wheat Sale Concern ContinuesEXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

MR. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the wheat deal with the Soviet Union continues to cause concern among many citizens. There is wonderment that our Government seems so determined to accomplish this transaction that it is willing to plod forward in negotiating terms in the face of repeated Soviet threats and blackmail, such as the harassment of our military convoys on the autobahn and the arrest on spy charges of an American educator who apparently has not seen fit to view Soviet communism as the ideal way of life.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared recently in the Northern Virginia Daily, a responsible daily newspaper published in Strasburg, Va. The editorial follows:

CALL OFF THE WHEAT SALE

We see no good reason why our Government should continue the cat and mouse game we have been playing with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. One moment we are the friends of the Russian people and the next we are their enemies, on the verge of a shooting war.

The mutable politician in the Kremlin can turn it on or off faster than any man in modern history—today professing warm friendship for the United States and tomorrow busily probing for our weaknesses.

In Moscow Wednesday, Mr. Khrushchev implied to a group of American businessmen that the convoy incident on the autobahn Tuesday could have ended in nuclear war. And he indirectly served notice that future Western convoys on the autobahn will be held up unless they bow to what he termed established procedure. Which, of course, is a unilateral premise based on a blatant and illegal disregard for Western rights of access to and from West Berlin.

While the Soviet delegation is in Washington negotiating for the sale of American wheat, and threatening to call off the entire deal unless their stipulations for shipment of the wheat are met, we are literally being challenged in Berlin. Not only challenged, but threatened as well.

Our responsibility to the civilized world requires that we negotiate on a diplomatic

basis with the Soviets, in a continuing effort to find formulas for preserving the peace of the world.

Frankly, we were also one of those who were inclined to look favorably on the \$250 million wheat deal with the Soviets, as a practical way of reducing our wheat surpluses and at the same time improving our dollar balance in Europe.

But, we do not have to do business with them, and under present conditions we should not. We don't like being bullied. We don't like being threatened. Every time our relations with the Soviets take a turn for the better, or the worse, we have the strangest feeling we are getting a Judas kiss from the man in the Kremlin. In other words, to use a modern, but trite expression, we are being had.

Our present judgment is that in view of the complicated structure of our relations with the Soviets, in which it is difficult if not impossible to divorce the economic from the military, and in view of the belligerent attitude they are now showing, the wheat sales negotiations should be called off.

Nor should they be resumed until such time as there is definite proof, of a permanent nature, of improved relations.

Tito's Brand of Communism Puts Yugoslavia Ahead of NeighborsEXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

MR. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Yugoslavia, while a relatively small nation, has played a very large part in the great post war power struggle.

I believe that history will point to the independent nature of Yugoslavia and its assertion of this desire for independence against Russia as having played a very significant role.

In the hope that greater understanding will be brought to Yugoslavia and its relationship with the United States, under permission previously granted, I insert the informative article by Robert H. Estabrook that appeared in the Washington Post:

TITO'S BRAND OF COMMUNISM PUTS YUGOSLAVIA AHEAD OF NEIGHBORS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

BELGRADE.—To understand what independent communism has come to mean in Yugoslavia, the Western visitor really ought to travel first through Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union.

Contrasts between conditions in Communist-bloc countries and the feverish activity here are so great that they almost make Yugoslavia seem a citadel of free enterprise.

It is not free in the Western sense, but it has rewards for individual initiative found in no other Communist country. Yugoslavia has developed a market economy with a supply demand price system and a wage range of individual incomes.

Belgrade, until recently a Serbian small town, has begun to look like a capital. Even in the last 18 months its face has been changed by new skyscrapers, some of them with imaginative use of glass. An imposing array of government buildings across the Sava River at Novi Beograd has touches of Brasilia.